UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,141	09/11/2003	Sebastien Perrot	PF030065	4968

24498 7590 04/07/2010

Robert D. Shedd, Patent Operations
THOMSON Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER	
ADDY, ANTHONY S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/07/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/660,141	PERROT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANTHONY S. ADDY	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 January 2010*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *2-10* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *2-10* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the appeal brief filed on January 21, 2010, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below./Patrick N. Edouard/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see pages 9-10 of the appeal brief, filed on January 21, 2010, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 2-10 under FINAL have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Doyle et al., U.S. Patent Number 7,099,295.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. **Claims 2** and **10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Meier, U.S. Patent Number 6,400,702 (hereinafter Meier)** and further in view of **Doyle et al., U.S. Patent Number 7,099,295 (hereinafter Doyle)**.

Regarding **claim 10**, Meier teaches a device (*e.g., $WDAP_S$ 441*) for connecting a centralized wireless network (e.g., *OWL radio network 421*) to at least one other network (*e.g., subnets 401 and 403*), said device being a wireless station (see col. 20, lines 28-34, col. 22, lines 29-35, col. 24, lines 29-41 and Fig. 9; *shows a wireless domain access point ($WDAP_S$ 441) [i.e. reads on a device for connecting a centralized wireless network 421 to a plurality of other wired networks 401 & 403*]), and further comprising:

a wireless interface for managing more than one MAC address (*e.g., the MAC addresses of remote stations 407 & 409*) for association with an access point (*e.g., $WDAP_P$ 425*) of said centralized wireless network (*i.e., the claimed limitations of "a wireless interface for managing more than one MAC address for association with an access point" is met by the teaching of Meier that using a spanning tree configuration, the plurality of intermediate wireless access points such as WMAP 431, 433 and 435, provide a wireless communication pathway between **$WDAP_S$ 441** and **$WDAP_P$ 425** to provide for communication among a plurality of remote stations on the subnets 401 and 403, such as a host computer 407 and personal computers 409, 411 and 413*) (see col. 22, lines 20-35 and col. 24, line 50 through col. 25, lines 10);

a bridge module for managing a plurality of ports for connecting to respective networks (see col. 10, lines 17-30, col. 20, lines 28-34, col. 24, lines 29-41 and col. 25, lines 8-10); and

a link management module for managing associations of different MAC addresses corresponding to devices (*e.g., Host 407 and PC 409*) connected to said at least one other network (*e.g., subnet 401*) with said access point (*i.e., $WDAP_P$ 425*) of said centralized wireless network (*i.e., OWL radio network 421*) such that said devices (*i.e., Host 407 and PC 409*) connected to said at least one other network (*i.e., subnet 401*) will appear as wireless stations to the access point (see col. 22, lines 20-35, col. 23, lines 23-29, col. 24, line 50 through col. 25, lines 10 and Fig. 9 [*i.e., the spanning tree protocol contained at the bridge device ($WDAP_s$ 441) reads on a link management module, since the spanning tree protocol is known in the art as a link management protocol and is specifically implemented in the bridging device ($WDAP_s$ 441) for monitoring communication traffic flow related to associations and disassociations of communication terminals in the centralized wireless network 421 and the wired networks 401 & 403*]).

Meir fails to explicitly teach said device being a wireless station compliant to IEEE 802.11 or Hiperlan 2 standards, and wherein said associations are as defined by the IEEE 802.11 or Hiperlan2 standards.

In an analogous field of endeavor, Doyle teaches a bridge apparatus can operate as an access point device between an IEEE 802.11 wireless network and a non-IEEE 802.11 wired network (see col. 6, lines 19-21 and figs. 1 and 5). According to Doyle, using the IEEE 802.11 protocol, the bridge apparatus provides a transparent interface or bridge between IEEE 802.11 wireless devices and non-IEEE 802.11 wired devices, such as a host computer or a network

controller that resides in the non-IEEE 802.11 wired network (see col. 6, lines 21-26). Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art further recognizes said device (*e.g., WDAPs 441*) for connecting a centralized wireless network (e.g., *OWL radio network 421*) to at least one other network (*e.g., subnets 401 and 403*) of Meier can be broadly characterized as a translational bridge that translates and forwards data between two mediums (*i.e., an 802.3 Ethernet subnets 401 & 403 and OWL radio network 421*) (see col. 22, lines 16-36), hence, it would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify said device of Meier with the bridging apparatus of Doyle, in order to provide a transparent interface between IEEE 802.11 wireless devices and non-IEEE 802.11 wired devices to translate and forward data between the two devices as taught by Doyle (see col. 6, lines 21-26 & 38-43).

Regarding **claim 2**, Meier in view of Doyle teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Meier in view of Doyle further teaches a device, further comprising means for determining a spanning tree for all networks attached to the device, comprising means for enabling or disabling the determination of the spanning tree (see *Meier*, col. 22, lines 29-35, col. 23, lines 23-29 and col. 24, lines 29-41).

5. **Claims 3-9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Meier, U.S. Patent Number 6,400,702 (hereinafter Meier)** and further in view of **Doyle et al., U.S. Patent Number 7,099,295 (hereinafter Baker)** as applied to **claim 10** above, and further in view of **Baker et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,570,366 (hereinafter Baker)**.

Regarding **claim 3**, Meier in view of Doyle teaches all the limitations of claim 10. Meier in view of Doyle fails to explicitly teach means for updating filtering tables for respective

connected networks, said filtering tables comprising information for determining whether a message on a network is to be forwarded to another network or not, said updating using a process by default, comprising means for enabling or disabling the default process.

Baker, however, teaches a bridge-based access point comprising means for updating filtering tables for respective connected networks (see col. 4, line 52 through col. 5, line 32, col. 6, lines 35-44 and Figures 1, 2 and 8), said filtering tables comprising information for determining whether a message on a network is to be forwarded to another network or not, said updating using a process by default (see col. 4, line 52 through col. 5, line 32 and col. 6, lines 35-44), comprising means for enabling or disabling the default process (see col. 5, lines 19-26 and Figures 1, 2 and 8).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Meier and Doyle with Baker to include means for updating filtering tables for respective connected networks, said filtering tables comprising information for determining whether a message on a network is to be forwarded to another network or not, said updating using a process by default, comprising means for enabling or disabling the default process, in order to efficiently transfer filtering information concerning a mobile terminal from one access point to another when the mobile terminal moves from the network of the one access point to the network of the another access point as per the teachings of Baker (see col. 2, lines 44-49).

Regarding **claim 4**, the combination of Meier, Doyle and Baker teaches all the limitations of claim 3. Baker further teaches a device, wherein said default process is based on analysis of source address in messages detected on a respective network, comprising means for enabling or

disabling message detection based updating (see col. 4, line 52 through col. 5, line 32 and col. 6, lines 35-44 and Figures 5-6 and 8).

Regarding **claim 5**, the combination of Meier, Doyle and Baker teaches all the limitations of claim 3. Baker further teaches a device, further comprising means for updating a filtering table for a given network based on a device discovery process specific to said given network (see col. 4, line 52 through col. 5, line 32 and col. 6, lines 35-44 and Figures 2 and 8).

Regarding **claim 6**, the combination of Meier, Doyle and Baker teaches all the limitations of claim 3. Baker further teaches a device, wherein said default process is enabled for an Ethernet network (see col. 3, lines 57-61 and col. 5, lines 19-32).

Regarding **claim 7**, the combination of Meier, Doyle and Baker teaches all the limitations of claim 3. Baker further teaches a device, wherein said default process is disabled for a USB network (see col. 3, lines 57-61 and col. 5, lines 19-32 [i.e. the limitation "said default process is disabled for a USB network" is met by Baker, since Baker teaches the enabling and disabling of a wired network which broadly reads on a USB network]).

Regarding **claim 8**, the combination of Meier, Doyle and Baker teaches all the limitations of claim 10. Baker further teaches a device, further comprising means for generating a message to said link management module upon a filtering table amendment, said means for generating a message having an enabled state and a disabled state for each network (see col. 4, line 52 through col. 5, line 32 and col. 6, lines 35-44 and Figures 2 and 8).

Regarding **claim 9**, the combination of Meier, Doyle and Baker teaches all the limitations of claim 8. Baker further teaches a device, wherein said means for generating a message are enabled for an Ethernet network (see col. 3, lines 57-61 and col. 5, lines 19-32).

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY S. ADDY whose telephone number is (571)272-7795. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 8:00am-6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571-272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. S. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Patrick N. Edouard/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617